

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9, 10, and 14 have been amended, and claims 6 and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-15 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 10 are independent claims.

Entry of the Amendments and Remarks is respectfully requested because entry of the Amendment places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. No new matters are believed to be added by these Amendments. In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone interviews of August 23, 2006 and August 24, 2006. During the telephone interviews, Applicants' representative discussed the Examiner's rejections of the present invention in view of Chang. The Examiner indicated that if Applicants amended independent claim 1 with the claim limitations of dependent claim 6 and amended independent claim 10 with the claim limitations of dependent claim 13, the Examiner would allow the remaining claims. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended with the claim limitations of dependent claims 6 and 13, respectively.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,436,221 issued to Chang, *et al.* ("Chang"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended with the claim limitations of dependent claim 6. Chang fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claim 1. Claims 2-4 are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable base claim. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 6, 10, 11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,436,221 issued to Chang, *et al.* ("Chang"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,645,402 issued to Kurokawa, *et al.* ("Kurokawa"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, Chang fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of claim 1. Kurokawa fails to cure the deficiencies of Chang. Accordingly, Chang in view of Kurokawa fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of the present invention as disclosed in amended claim 1.

Claim 10 has been amended with the claim limitations of dependent claim 13. Chang fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 10. Kurokawa fails to cure

the deficiencies of Chang. Accordingly, Chang in view of Kurokawa fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of the present invention as disclosed in amended claim 10.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 5, 6, 10, 11, and 15. Claim 5 is allowable at least because it depends from an allowable base claim. Claim 6 has been canceled. Claims 11 and 15 are allowable at least because they depend on an allowable base claim. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 5, independent claim 10, and all claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,436,221 issued to Chang, *et al.* ("Chang"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,623,720 issued to Howard, *et al.* ("Howard"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, Chang fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of amended claim 1. Applicants note that U.S. Patent No. 6,623,720 is issued to Thompson, *et al.*, not Howard, *et al.* as indicated in the Office Action (page 6, paragraph 6). Applicants believe the citation is meant to read, "U.S. Patent No. 5,848,925, issued to Howard, *et al.*" Howard fails to cure the deficiencies of Chang. Accordingly, Chang in view of Howard fails to teach each and every claimed feature of the present invention as disclosed in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 7. Claim 7 is allowable at least because it depends on an allowable base claim. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination,

discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is allowable.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,436,221 issued to Chang, *et al.* ("Chang"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, Chang fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 8. Claim 8 is allowable at least because it depends on an allowable base claim. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is allowable.

Claims 9, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,436,221 issued to Chang, *et al.* ("Chang"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,645,402 issued to Kurokawa, *et al.* ("Kurokawa"), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,013,238 issued to Murata, *et al.* ("Murata"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, Chang in view of Kurokawa fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of amended claim 1. Murata fails to cure the deficiencies of Chang and Kurokawa. As noted above, Chang in view of Kurokawa fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of amended claim 10. Murata fails to cure the deficiencies of Chang and Kurokawa.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 9, 13 and 14. Claim 9 is allowable at least because it depends on an allowable base claim. Claim 13 has been canceled. Claim 14 is allowable at least because it depends on an allowable base claim. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 9 and 14 are allowable.

Claims 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,436,221 issued to Chang, *et al.* ("Chang"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,645,402 issued to Kurokawa, *et al.* ("Kurokawa"), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,623,720 issued to Howard, *et al.* ("Howard"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, Chang in view of Kurokawa fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of amended claim 1. Applicants note that U.S. Patent No. 6,623,720 is issued to Thompson, *et. al.*, not Howard, *et. al.* as indicated in the Office Action (See Office Action, page 6, paragraph 6). Applicants believe the citation is meant to read, "U.S. Patent No. 5,848,925, issued to Howard, *et. al.*" Howard fails to cure the deficiencies of Chang and Kurokawa.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 12. Claim 12 is allowable at least because it depends on an allowable base claim. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: August 25, 2006

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/BYC/kbs